

## REMARKS

In the patent application, claims 1-34 are pending. In the office action, claims 1-5 and 18-22 are rejected, and claims 6-17 and 23-34 are objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicant has amended claims 6 and 24 to place claims 6-17 and 24-34 in condition for allowance.

Applicant has also amended claims 1 and 18 to include the limitation that the reduction ratio is determined at least partly based on a relationship between the target image size and the original image size. The support for the amendment can be found on p.8, Equation 5 and p.9, Equation 8. Equation 5 shows the relation between the palette reduction ratio  $R$  and the entropy scaling factor ( $ESF$ ). Equation 8 shows the relationship between  $ESF$  and  $(S_f/F)$ , where  $S_f$  is the estimated reduced file size and  $F$  is the file size of the original compressed image.  $S_f$  must be substantially equal to the target file size  $F_n$  (p.12, lines 9-11). Thus,  $R$  is partially related to  $(F_n/F)$ .

No new matter has been introduced.

Applicant has added new claims 35-38. The support for these claims can be found on p.7, lines 12-33 and p.9, lines 23 – 32, and claims 1, 6, 7, 9 and 13-16.

No new matter has been introduced.

At section 1 of the office action, claims 1-3, 5, 18-20 and 22 are rejected under 35 102(b) as being anticipated by *Trueblood* (U.S. Patent No. 5,463,702).

In rejecting claims 1 and 18, the Examiner states that *Trueblood* discloses a method of reducing an input image of an original size for providing a reduced image of a target image smaller than the original image size (col.7, lines 7-13).

It is respectfully submitted that *Trueblood* discloses a color compression technique to reduce a raster image data file from  $n$  possible colors for each pixel to  $k$  total colors where  $n > k > 1$  (col.7, lines 7-13). For example, the  $n$  possible colors in a 24 RGB color image are 16 million represented by 24 bits and  $k$  is 256 represented by an 8 bit bit-plane. Thus, according to *Trueblood*, the image size is the same but the possible colors for each pixel in the same image

can be reduced from  $n$  to  $k$ . *Trueblood* does not disclose or even suggest reducing a palette size for use in a reduced image wherein the reduction in the pallet size is based on a relationship between the target image size and the original image size.

For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, and 18 are clearly distinguishable over the cited *Trueblood* reference. For the same reason, claim 35 is also distinguishable over the cited *Trueblood* reference.

As for claims 2, 3, 5, 19, 20, 22, 36-38, they are dependent from claims 1, 18 and 35 and recite features not recited in claims 1, 18 and 35. For reasons regarding claims 1, 18 and 35 above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2, 3, 5, 19, 20, 22, 23, 36-38 are also distinguishable over the cited *Trueblood* reference.

At section 2, claims 4 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Trueblood* in view of *Music et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,857,991, hereafter referred to as *Music*). The Examiner cites *Music* for disclosing average run length of the palette index coefficients in the input image.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 4 and 21 are dependent from claims 1 and 18, respectively and recite features not recited in claims 1 and 18. Thus, claims 4 and 21 are also distinguishable over the cited *Trueblood* and *Music* references.

## CONCLUSION

Claims 1-38, as amended, are allowable. Early allowance of claims 1-38 is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Kenneth Q. Lao  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Registration No. 40,061

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS  
& ADOLPHSON LLP  
Bradford Green, Building Five  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, CT 06468  
Telephone: (203) 261-1234  
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676  
USPTO Customer No. 004955